

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated **May 12, 2009**. The Office Action rejected claims 19-21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30-35, and 38-42 under 35 USC § 102(e) over Lau (US 6,165,210), rejected claim 22 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Lau in view of Song (US 5,330,500), and rejected claims 28 and 29 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Lau in view of Wiktor (US 5,653,727).

Claims 19, 30, and 32 are herein amended to provide additional clarity. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least in paragraph [0027] and Figures 2, 4, and 5 of the published application.

Claim 20 is herein canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In light of the foregoing amendments and following comments, Applicants request reconsideration.

Rejections over 6,165,210 to Lau

The immediate application is a continuation of application 09/271,304 which issued as US Patent 6,319,277 (hereinafter the '277 patent). During prosecution of the '277 patent, a Declaration was submitted to swear behind US Patent 5,876,432 to Lau (the '432 patent). The '432 patent is a divisional of 6,165,210. Thus, the '432 patent and 6,165,210 share the same 102(e) date of April 1, 1994. As noted above, patent 6,165,210 was cited in the Office Action against the immediate claims.

During the prosecution of the immediate application, Applicants previously submitted the same Declaration (used to swear behind the '432 patent) to swear behind patent 5,554,181 to Das. See Applicants' Response filed February 23, 2009. Applicants submit that the Declaration filed in Applicants' February 23, 2009 response is sufficient under 37 CFR § 1.131 to swear behind 6,165,210 at least because it was used to swear behind the '432 patent to Lau in the parent case. Consequently, Applicants request that patent number 6,165,210 to Lau be removed as a prior art reference.

As 6,165,210 to Lau was used to reject claims 19-24, 26-35, and 38-42, Applicants' submit that all rejections are moot. Consequently, Applicants request reconsideration of the aforementioned claims.

Conclusion

Based on at least the foregoing remarks, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 19-24, 26-35, and 38-42. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: July 8, 2009

By: /James M. Urzedowski/
James M. Urzedowski
Registration No.: 48596

6640 Shady Oak Rd., Suite 400
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7834
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001
f:\wpwork\jmu\14438us04_amd_20090605.doc